

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 1 and 2. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1 and 2, replace the original sheets including Figures 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 10-15, and 17-20 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 10 and 17 have been amended and claims 2-5 and 16 have been canceled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not depicting particular claimed features. The Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets" Figures 1 and 2 have been amended to reflect the ducting formed as a single member as cited in claim 7 by depicting item 22a in phantom. The center duct, although noted by the Examiner as not being shown, is depicted as item 21 in Figure 1, which is a seat side view.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. The Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Specifically, the Abstract has been revised and the content of claim 7 has been added to paragraph [0023]. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 6, and 10-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0 411 375 A1 (made of record via IDS). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

The subject matter of original claims 2 and 3 has been placed into claim 1. The Applicants contend that Tarzia EP 0411375 does not disclose “a center connection duct located in a center console of said vehicle.” Tarzia EP '375 seems to utilize separate feeder lines to the seats from the floor as best seen in Fig. 3 and 4 (duct 10 seems to be in the cross-hatched floor). From Tarzia EP '375, “According to the invention the air conditioning system further includes a duct 10 disposed in correspondence with each front seat to provide for conditioning of the seat itself.” (Page 2, lines 21-24). Applicants’ claimed invention is different with at least “a center connection duct located in a center console of said vehicle.” See Applicants’ item 21 in Figure 1.

Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended to recite “wherein said center duct portion is located beside said seat bottom portion in a horizontal plane.” Tarzia EP 0411375 does not disclose such a structure. The advantage of such a center duct structure is that separate ducts for each front seat do not have to be installed between the air conditioning unit behind the dash, and each seat. As depicted in Applicants’ Figure 1, from the connection point 21a, a duct need only run to the center duct 21, and not to the

dash. Applicants' claimed structure saves at least ducting, installation time, and money. Furthermore, loss of blowing force due to friction is reduced because dual ducting does not have to be run from the seat to the air conditioning unit behind the dash. This may permit a smaller blower motor to move the same amount of air as a larger blower with dual ducts.

Claim 17

Claim 17 has been amended to include "a center connection duct located next to said seat bottom portion between vehicle seats, said center connection duct connected to said u-shaped duct to supply air to all ducts." Tarzia EP 0411375 does not disclose such a structure. The advantage of such a center duct structure is that separate ducts for each front seat do not have to be installed between the air conditioning unit behind the dash, and each seat. As depicted in Applicants' Figure 1, from the connection point 21a, a duct need only run to the center duct 21, and not to the dash. Applicants' claimed structure saves at least ducting, installation time, and money. Furthermore, loss of blowing force due to friction is reduced because dual ducting does not have to be run from the seat to the air conditioning unit behind the dash. This may permit a smaller blower motor to move the same amount of air as a larger blower with dual ducts.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over EP 0 411 375 A1 (made of record

via IDS). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Because claim 1 has been amended, claim 7 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2006

By: 

H. Keith Miller, Reg. No. 22,484

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

HKM:MDF:ca